,	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/033,835	CHANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leigh C. Maier	1623	
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>after final</u>			
(1) <u>Leigh C. Maier</u> .	(3)		
(2) Howard Eisenberg.	(4)		
Date of Interview: 17 December 2004	Time: <u>9:00 am</u>		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	pplicant's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: n/a			
Claims discussed: 45, 63, and 74			
Prior art documents discussed: none			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G See Continuation Sheet	SENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	TWAS DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sur 	n. The examiner will provide a	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Exr indicated that in order for claims to be consistent with stated reasons for allowance in final rejection, the compositions must have at least 0.5% of BCD and be stable (as recited). The claims reciting "about 0.5%" allows for less than 0.5%. Mr Eisenberg authorized an examiner's amendment to delete "about" in claims 45, 63, and 74.